FILED 1 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 2 JAN 22 2014 3 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 INVESTMENT MANAGMENT COMPANY.) CASE NO. CV 13-9508 UA (SH) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION 13 VS. EBONI BERRY, JASON WILLIAMS et al, 14 15 Defendants. 16 The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily 17 18 because Defendant removed it improperly. On October 28, 2011, Defendant Jason Williams, having been sued in what 19 20 appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice Of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed 21 in forma pauperis. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover 22 23 because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court. 24

Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in

the first place, in that Defendants do not competently allege facts supplying either diversity

or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a);

see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S.Ct. 2611, 162

25

26

27

28

L.Ed.2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000. Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b). Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, Santa Monica Courthouse, 1725 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90401-3299 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: //12/14GEORGE H. KING CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE